UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

A Redefinition of God - - - - *J. Ray Shute*

Adenauer: Germany's New Leader - - - - - - - - - - *Joachim Joesten*

The Gathered Church in the Gathered Community - - - - - - - - - *Harry Taylor*

Semantics and Tradition - - *Sheldon Shepard*

The Making of Robert Burns - *Leonard B. Gray*

Psychiatry and Religion - - - *Philip Schug*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXV NUMBER 6

Chicago, January-February, 1950

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Leonard B. Gray: Minister of The First Congregational Church, Lynn, Massachusetts.

Joachim Joesten: Worldover Press Correspondent.

Charles W. Phillips: Minister of the First Unitarian Church of Des Moines, Iowa.

Philip Schug: Minister of All Souls Unitarian Society, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Sheldon Shepard: President of the California Universalist Convention.

J. Ray Shute: Mayor of Monroe, North Carolina.

Harry Taylor: Minister of the Community Church, Jennings Lodge, Oregon.

Evans A. Worthley: Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Iowa City, Iowa.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 103

ARTICLES—

A Redefinition of God—J. RAY SHUTE 104

Adenauer: Germany's New Leader—JOACHIM JOESTEN 106

The Gathered Church in the Gathered Community—HARRY TAYLOR 107

Semantics and Tradition—SHELDON SHEPARD 111

The Making of Robert Burns—LEONARD B. GRAY 112

Psychiatry and Religion—PHILIP SCHUG 116

POETRY—The Saint—To Dr. John Haynes Holmes—MARY CRAIG SINCLAIR 105

THE STUDY TABLE—

Importance of Understanding—EVANS A. WORTHLEY 117

Criticism of Toynbee—CHARLES W. PHILLIPS 117

Wit and Wisdom—RANDALL S. HILTON 118

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 119

THE FIELD—

Roger Baldwin's Successor—*American Civil Liberties Union Bulletin* 102

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Roger Baldwin's Successor

Dr. John Haynes Holmes, chairman of the Board of Directors of the American Civil Liberties Union, has announced the election by the Union's board of Prof. Patrick M. Malin of Swarthmore College as director of the Union to succeed Roger N. Baldwin, who on January 1 relinquished the post he had held for thirty years, to specialize in international civil rights.

Professor Malin took over the directorship on February 1 at the close of the academic half-year.

Dr. Holmes' announcement said that "the election of Professor Malin by the Board expressed the unanimous agreement of us all as to his qualifications for this important national work. He is not only a teacher of high standing in his field of economics, but he has had abundant administrative experience in social service and government work both at home and abroad."

The new ACLU director has been a member of the economics department at Swarthmore since 1930. During the war he served for four years as vice-director of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, with headquarters in London. He also was American Director of the International Migration Service, Price Executive of the OPA Chemical and Drugs Branch in Washington, and Deputy Chief of the Division of Program and Requirements in the State Department's Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations. His work has taken him to Great Britain and Continental Europe, including the Soviet Union, the Near East, Canada, the West Indies, and South America.

Professor Malin served as vice-chairman of the American Friends Service Committee from 1936 to 1938. He is also a member of the Board of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education and served as the president of that group from 1939 to 1943.

He is a member of the Society of Friends (Quakers) and an independent in politics. Born in Joplin,

(*Continued on page* 118)

UNITY

Volume CXXXV JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1950 No. 6

EDITORIAL

The grandest humanitarian work carried on under Unitarian auspices during the one hundred and twenty-five years of organized Unitarianism in America is that of the Unitarian Service Committee. This work was organized originally as a committee of the American Unitarian Association. In 1949 it became a separately incorporated independent body. Its purposes were grandly conceived and they have been carried out magnificently. Medical services have been rendered in many lands. Children in Europe have been fed and clothed and given new hope. Displaced intellectuals have been rescued and given a new life in free America. Topnotch medical authorities have been sent to Greece, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria, Germany, and Colombia to conduct Institutes for the purpose of bringing native physicians up to date on recent medical developments. Institutes of similar nature in the field of social service have been conducted in Germany. On the home field work camps for Unitarian Youth and other socially valuable projects have been organized, supervised, and financed. The quality and the breadth for which Unitarians are noted have been evidenced in the program of the Service Committee. In the financing of this work the American Unitarian Association has been generous, Unitarian Churches have contributed freely, and big-hearted individuals have dug deep into their pockets. But even so the big end of the expenditure through the years has come from non-Unitarian sources. Twice during the past twelve months Eleanor Roosevelt has made favorable comment on the work of the Committee in her famous press column. The President of the United States and other well-known statesmen have commended the Committee. The Congregationalists and the Universalists have cooperated financially and otherwise. International relief-giving agencies have channelled work through the Committee. The very name Unitarian has been glorified, and the faith that it represents has become known to millions who never before knew it. Now the time has come to put the Unitarian Service Committee on a sound membership basis. Individual membership dues are $5.00 a year. There should be Chapters of the Committee in every Unitarian Church in the land. The end of this year should see at least 25,000 persons signed up as members of the Service Committee. Many people will, of course, give more than $5.00 — some hundreds and some thousands — but at the $5.00 level practically every Unitarian can and should maintain a membership. This is serious business and should be regarded as such by ministers and church officers. A religious movement that has always emphasized its interest in practical humanitarian good works should now be quick to channel this interest through a competently staffed and efficiently managed agency of its own creation. I have no doubt of the willingness of the laity to rally to the Service Committee. But at this time it is imperative that the ministers and the church officers be diligent in making known the facts and in providing opportunity for response. The cause is supremely important. The response should be immediate, unanimous, and generous.

Curtis W. Reese.

A Redefinition of God

J. RAY SHUTE

Of all creatures man, alone, refuses to long remain in doubt about anything. He, likewise, refuses to be a crass fatalist who accepts, without question, any definition or statement. For that reason, he asks those who make authoritative pronouncements to furnish their credentials for such utterances. When not produced, then such utterances are stamped "private opinion" and take their place along with similar opinions from others—all are without any particular value. We find ourselves concurring with Mark Twain, when he said that one man's opinion is as good as another's, if not better! Being incurably religious by his very nature, man has fussed and fumed over the idea of God for many thousands of years and to date there has been no pat definition which seems to stand up under the best critical methods employed by honest scholarship. So, today, the semantic controversy continues apace and apparently we are no nearer acceptance of a terminology than we were at any other period in our long history.

It is exceedingly difficult to approach the subject of God with open heart and mind and to bring to our discussion the same critical attitude that we would employ in a discussion of any other subject, but this is essential if we are to be honest with both ourselves and our audience. Agreed that we no longer approach the study with any degree of fear whatever, at the very same time we are so prejudiced and conditioned by these many centuries of indoctrination that we find that ere we can bring forth any suggestions of consequence, we are compelled, originally, to clear away the accumulated accretions of past centuries. Thus, we are forced to assume, whether or not we like it, the role of the iconoclast and temporarily employ this technique to clear away the rubbish and debris so that we may have at least partially cleared ground for our foundations. Let it be said here that the object of this discussion is not to arrive at any preconceived conclusion or, for that matter, at any conclusion whatever—we are just thinking aloud.

It would, unquestionably, be honest to also say that whether or not there is God, or whether or not such a symbol has validity in a scientific age, is beyond the scope of this dissertation and we do not intend to enter this highly debatable area of discussion at this time. We are beginning our study with the assumption that man either desires or needs the idea of God in his cosmological frame of reference. This premise is questionable, to be sure, but we are using it as a point of orientation, or perhaps we should say as a point of departure, and we will now consider some of the ideas of God which are accepted in the religious life of our times. We are not going to place values on these ideas, because we feel our complete incompetency so to do.

Perhaps most significant of all is the fact that God must have limitations, restrictions, and purely human attributes and characteristics; yes, even sex. And this is not too unusual, for do we not do exactly the same thing with almost everything else—even our children's toys? Consequently, Western civilization has determined that God shall be male, adult, white, and possessed of all of our own faculties and thought-concepts. God must not be too great, or too profound, or too spiritual for man to comprehend, conceive, or understand. In that sense, then, God becomes the noblest handiwork of man, whether or not Mary is his mother, and this conception of God renders him a literal superman, no less. This is, I take it, a popular everyday concept that millions of our people have of God. The term "spiritual," to such people, is really without much meaning because the term is used to define and express an *unalive* state which differs from the living only in one major particular—that being that spirit is beyond the grave. We call such a conception anthropomorphism, because everything in the spiritual is a counterpart of the living, and God is, as we pointed out, a superman. There is little to discuss in this concept, since it is a dream-world and exists only in the minds of those under its spell. The Bible furnishes the authority for this position and if this is accepted then one may find a type of happiness in these dreams and can, also, without any difficulty accept as factual the fairy tales of the nursery and give to his reason a perpetual holiday. It is not without regret that we are compelled to state that far too many humans are anthropomorphists.

The concept of God as a spirit, presiding over a supernatural overworld, or universe, is no doubt the most popular idea currently extant. The difficulty we encounter in attempting a definition of this God is in reaching an understanding, if not an agreement, on the meaning of the term "spiritual," or "supernatural." We usually bog down in abstractions when we seek to define an area of discussion concerning which we have no first-hand information at all. We can only know what opinions are currently held and the reasons behind such opinions. To some, it is quite obvious, the spiritual and the mental may be said to be somewhat analogous, and survival connotes the transmigration of the human mind into a continuum after death. The experiments of Dr. J. B. Rhine, of the Duke University parapsychology laboratory, have certainly been outstanding, but extra-sensory perception and mental survival are two entirely different matters. We cannot accept a theory that there can be mental function without the source of such function—namely, the human brain. Consequently, we must, until further evidence is adduced, rule out this concept of immortality. It should be noted in passing, that some of our best thinkers are doing excellent research in this field and in time they might have much more to say before we are through with this matter. A theory advanced by Dr. Horace Westwood might well be mentioned in this connection. Assuming that we can apply scientific methodology to the subject and find that there are laws governing the "psychic world," then we have a virgin field of exploration before us. We might then be able to say that man is a spirit in the same sense that God is a spirit; but man has a body, which he discards in the *natural* process of living. It is interesting to note that this particular theory denies supernaturalism, since everything that occurs is natural.

It is a popular, and understandable, procedure to call "spiritual" those unknown qualities in life which are

beyond and outside of human experience, and yet they are believed to be a part of the universe and to exert an influence on us all. In this respect God would be the divine X, or unknown quantity, and surely this definition would be legitimate and at the same time extremely honest. Certainly we do not know anything definitely about God; we can merely indicate what to us are evidences and demonstrations of the divine and these manifestations have meaning and value to us. We can believe in a universal force that has reason and significance in life and concurrently admit that man is a free agent and on his own. This belief would admit of the idea of immortality on a novel and meaningful level, but we are not here concerned with that particular inquiry. In the sense that God would be a spirit that pervades all nature, then, this definition would give us a natural, and not a supernatural, deity.

When we use such terminology as "the will of God," or the "divine plan," or similar terms, we at once become guilty of humanizing the non-human, and such practice is, in our opinion, both illegitimate and irrational. Man knows of love and mercy and other high principles only in human terms. There are no experiences of man that transcend the human qualities of which man is capable in his highest and noblest moments. If, indeed, there are such experiences as "divine love," etc., then, they would, of necessity, be entirely and completely human, else they would be beyond human cognition and experience. Human qualities, be it remembered, after all is said and done, are still *human* qualities, no less. When and if examples of supra-human experiences are presented to us in sincerity and with validity, then, and then only, can we bestow upon deity the virtues which humanity prizes so highly. Since each culture produces in and of itself those virtues upon which human value is placed, it would appear rather presumptuous for any particular age to assume that those value systems current at any time would be those best suited for divine adoption. Hence, if we accept the theory of a spiritual God, we must, even against our will, permit the deity to assume its own value patterns, concerning which we unquestionably would have no knowledge, unless we lend sanction to intuition—which we most assuredly do not!

Dr. John Haynes Holmes' theory of a growing God is unique and has meaning if we can accept the totality of life in the sense that all nature grows apace, and with it God, too, grows and evolves. We are at a loss to understand, however, what would happen in cases of throwbacks which occur from time to time in the course of history and cause temporary lulls, or even retrogression, in the processes of evolution. As we remember the concept of Dr. Holmes, in the same sense that man experiences failure, setbacks, and other problems, so would God be subject to the same circumstances. There are those, of course, who find fault with this definition of God and can see little significance in the idea, since it is concerned with a new type of universal—one that does not originate the laws governing the universe, but, rather, must be subject to them. It must be said that the idea, in our opinion, has far more validity than many others more widely held.

Many of our traditionalists chewed their nails when first they heard Dr. A. Powell Davies refer to old God-concepts as wishful pleadings for a divine nursemaid in the skies! But he was everlastingly right in his point of view. His pleas for an adult religion are as desirable as they are valid. It is conceivable that we would all be much happier if we would desist from our very bad habit of condemning those whose definitions differ from our own. If we are morally honest, we most assuredly are forced to the conclusion that all concepts of God are human and, therefore, are subject to variation and interpretation. Who amongst us would have the audacity to say: "I know in very truth that my opinion is correct beyond a peradventure and so positive am I and so valid is the evidence that I produce, that all men should concur with me."? When all is said and done, no man knoweth God—it is ours to experience, not to understand, the divine. And when we have experienced life in its fullest and when we have lived abundantly, it is then that we have truly experienced the divine.

The humanist concept of God, when and if the symbol is employed, becomes a permissive relationship between man and the universe. This definition is entirely unsatisfactory, in that permission, in this case, infers authority from beyond man, which the humanist denies. If we say that nature is favorable—hence, permissive—we are dodging the issue and substituting the symbol "nature" for the symbol "God." If a redefinition of the symbols is agreed to, then the humanist, the naturalist, the theist, and the deist will find themselves much closer together than most of them realize. If, for example, we substituted the symbol "God" for "nature," "life," or "love," the results would prove amazing. We could then sing "I Love God," rather than "I Love Life." We could have a "commitment to God," rather than to nature. We could say: "There abideth Faith, Hope, and God, but the greatest of these is God." Would not this redefinition have meaning in our theology and philosophy and would it not ease the tension in our terminological difficulties? It certainly is indicated and a trial could certainly do no harm whatever.

The symbol "God" has meaning of deep and abiding significance and to suggest that it be scrapped is both unwarranted and illogical. Until mankind has developed powers far beyond his present ken, we will continue to raise our eyes, our voices, our hearts, and our hopes to the greatest living symbol of the ages; and regardless of our varying theologies and philosophies, we will, in our great moments of joy and despair, call out to the only source conceivable to us beyond humanity; and, as we call, the word that will always issue forth will be "God."

The Saint

To Dr. John Haynes Holmes

Like a swimmer charting course
From the mouth of some great stream
To the highlands of its source
Must the saint pursue his dream.
Set against the mighty sweep
Of the water's downward flow,
He, with God a tryst must keep
On the summit's feeding snow.

MARY CRAIG SINCLAIR.
(MRS. UPTON SINCLAIR.)

Adenauer: Germany's New Leader

JOACHIM JOESTEN

With the election of Dr. Konrad Adenauer as Germany's new leader, by conservative parties in the Bonn Assembly, the people of Western Germany enter a different phase of their post-war life. In Adenauer, what sort of guide will they have? What background does he bring to his job?

In the minds of most Germans, the name of Konrad Adenauer is immediately associated with the city of Cologne, Germany's third largest. There he was born on January 5, 1876. There, too, he won his administrative spurs as lord mayor from 1917 to 1933. All that modern Cologne is—or, rather, was until the Nazis and the war made a hash of it—the city has Adenauer to thank for.

Young Konrad was not born in a bed of roses. One of four children of a middle class family, he was called upon at an early age to help eke out the family budget. Like his two brothers, he took private teaching jobs while still in high school.

His father wanted him to be a bank clerk, but Konrad had other things in mind. He studied law and political economy, and after graduating from college entered a Cologne law office.

The head of the firm, Justizrat Kaisen, was not only a prominent lawyer, but also an influential politician. In 1906, the post of assistant to the mayor was vacant. Adenauer asked his chief point blank: "Don't you think I am as qualified as anybody else for this job?" The boss smilingly agreed, and Konrad was in.

Adenauer proved himself an able executive and an adroit politican. In 1910, he become deputy mayor at a yearly salary of 18,000 marks ($4,320), a large sum at that time.

Seven years later, he was elected lord mayor. From the first day of his tenure, he devoted all his energies to the task of embellishing and modernizing the 2,000-year-old city. He later confided to a reporter: "When I sit in my office at the town hall, I keep thinking of how the Roman empire passed away, the old German empire passed away, Kaiser Wilhelm's empire passed away—and this old metropolis survived it all. It is well worth one's best efforts."

Mayor Adenauer did not know then that still another empire, that of Adolph Hitler, would come and pass away and that it would all but engulf the "sacred city" in deadly ruin.

Under Adenauer's administration, Cologne expanded and blossomed. A new university was built; a 22-mile-long belt of parklands was strung around the sprawling city; the stadium, one of Germany's most modern athletic grounds, was added; a new bridge was thrown across the Rhine river; new industrial plants mushrooned; the Cologne Fair was organized.

A prominent member of the Catholic Center party, Adenauer became influential in Prussian and Reich politics. He was president of the Prussian state council for a number of years. Once, in May, 1926, he was asked by Reich President Paul von Hindenburg to form a cabinet, but his attempt failed.

Reared in the Rhenish tradition of individualism and international outlook, Adenauer never was a friend of the Nazis. Immediately after the advent of Hitler, in March, 1933, he was suspended as lord mayor of Cologne and president of the Prussian state council. For the next two years he lived in retirement at the famous monastery of Maria Laach. Since 1935 he has been a resident of Honnef, a small town on the Rhine not far from Cologne.

The Nazis did not further harass the aging politician, except on one occasion. After an abortive attempt on Hitler's life July 20, 1944, Adenauer was arrested by the Gestapo—on his 25th wedding anniversary—and imprisoned for eight weeks.

On a Sunday morning in March, 1945, Adenauer's career nearly came to an end. The American First Army was on the rampage in the Rhineland. An armored spearhead made a stab for the Remagen bridgehead.

In nearby Honnef, the then sixty-nine-year-old Adenauer was tilling his garden. Three shells which an American gun fired in his exact direction were not intended for him. Luckily all three missed. At the first blast, the Sunday gardener had thrown himself flat on his stomach.

Adenauer had barely recovered from the shock before he received a message from the American commander in Cologne asking him to resume his former post as mayor. He accepted, but did not stay in office very long. Within a few months he was ousted by the British, who had taken over Cologne from the United States forces.

Ever since, Adenauer has devoted all his time and energies to the Christian Democratic Union, successor to the old Center party. At three successive conventions he was elected chairman of the party for the western zones.

Tall and gaunt, Adenauer is a man of dignified yet slightly quizzical appearance. Attentive observers of his oval, weatherbeaten face will be puzzled by certain Mongolian traits around his nose and cheekbones. These Oriental features are not due to any racial mixture, but to an automobile accident. It occurred in 1917, while he was still deputy mayor. His chauffeur fell asleep at the wheel and the automobile collided with a streetcar. Adenauer suffered severe facial injuries.

Adenauer leads a regular life. He neither drinks nor smokes, but he has a sweet tooth. At bedtime, in particular, he enjoys nibbling a bar of chocolate or some other candy. His only other known "vice," which he shares with his chief political rival, the Socialist Kurt Schumacher, is reading murder mysteries.

He rises early, usually around 5 o'clock, washing in cold water, even in winter. He always shaves himself (a cavalier mustache which he wore in his younger years went overboard long ago, as did his Prussian haircut). At 9:30 he is ready for the short ride from his country house at Honnef to nearby Bonn, capital of the new state.

Adenauer has been married twice. His first wife, who gave him three children, died in 1916. In his second marriage, contracted three years later, he had four more. One of his sons, Max, is traffic commissioner in Cologne; another, Paul, recently was ordained a priest.

The Allied high commission, which will supervise the Bonn government, may find Adenauer a tough customer. Even in the past, the Christian Democratic Union leader has voiced some of the frankest criticism yet addressed to the occupation powers by the defeated powers.

A year ago he told an audience at Duesseldorf: "We are not an African tribe, but a central European nation proud of its country." He will have an opportunity now to show that the Germans have cast off some tribal habits acquired under Hitler.

The Gathered Church in the Gathered Community

HARRY TAYLOR

Up to the year 1914 a great many of us were living in a world of fancy. We believed in the progress of mankind onward and upward forever. We took it for granted that democratic institutions were gradually spreading throughout the world. We thought that when we had finally gotten rid of kings, kaisers, and czars they would be the last of their breed. I am thinking now of the Independent Labor Party in England in those days, of which I was a member. We were—so it seems to me, looking back—very, very naive and very, very ignorant of the secret forces in the world even then slowly converging on the first Armageddon.

I remember that I had a rude awakening three years before the First World War broke out in August, 1914. It was the summer of 1911 when tension was rising in Europe between Germany on the one hand and France and England on the other, concerning Morocco. Germany sent a gunboat called the *Panther* to Agadir as a kind of gesture as to how she felt.

I happened at that time to be in Carlisle, on the border between England and Scotland, very late at night. I was standing beside the main railway lines between England and Scotland. Suddenly out of the darkness I heard a train approaching. I looked at it and saw that it was filled with soldiers. And there were about a dozen trains following behind that first one, all loaded with soldiers.

I learned some time later that these soldiers that I had seen that night were part of an expeditionary force being shipped down to the English Channel, ready to be sent over to France perchance war broke out. Yet the British people at that moment were asleep in their beds and entirely unaware that preparations for war were going on right under their very noses. Then it was that I began to sense the power of persons working behind the scenes and directing the destinies of peoples, who, for the most part, were entirely unaware of what was taking place.

Taking a long look back over that period embracing the first and second World Wars I realize how, slowly but surely, the world of men has more and more found itself in the grip of circumstances that it has been entirely unable to control. In the year 1920 John Maynard Keynes, famous British economist, wrote a book entitled *The Economic Consequences of the Peace.* At the close of this book he wrote:

> For the immediate future events are taking charge and the near destiny of Europe is no longer in the hands of any man. The events of the coming year will not be shaped by the deliberate acts of statesmen, but by the hidden currents, flowing continuously beneath the surface of political history, of which no one can predict the outcome.

So wrote J. M. Keynes in 1920. He was more of a prophet than he realized. For events took charge not only for the brief year that he thought of, but right up to our threshold today.

Those of us who call ourselves world lovers and men of good will felt a strange inward shrinking as we saw the rise to power of Hitler in Germany and Lenin and Stalin in Russia. These men represented the new paganism. Almost within a decade they enthroned naked power, discarded almost all semblance of morality, and openly sneered at Christianity as an effete and time-worn superstition.

It seems almost incredible that within such a short span of years vast areas of the world should suffer a blackout of the best of our civilization and culture and become slaves of police states. It seems to me that even now, at this late date, few people are aware of the gigantic strides that paganism has made over the world, or of the ever-lessening circle of influence of Christian Democracy.

Untold millions of human beings today eat, drink, sleep, carry on, with little or no interest in what is happening around them. Thomas Hardy, in his play, *The Dynasts,* has a line which goes: "The pale, pathetic people still plod on." One might reëcho the sad plaint of the prophet of old: "My people love to have it so."

Adolph Hitler boasted that if he fell he would pull down the world with him. I sometimes wonder whether in his uncanny, devilish prescience he did not foresee exactly what would happen even if his own enterprise failed and he himself went down to defeat. Other men, also intoxicated with the lust of power, would use his techniques, hoping to succeed where he failed. Indeed, at the present time in Russia the Nazi technique has been improved upon so as to make Hitler look like a piker.

It seems to me that if we would correctly evaluate the position of the Christian churches in the world of 1950 we must see the world of men and affairs exactly as it is. We must be realists and know exactly where we stand.

H. G. Wells, a few years before he died, lost his faith in the future of the human race. He wrote a little book entitled *Mind at the End of its Tether.* I do not accept the conclusions he arrived at. I believe that humanity will survive the great ordeal it is even now approaching. I believe that a newborn Christian Church, fitted for the occasion, will lead mankind once more out of darkness into light. But do not let us minimize H. G. Wells' prophecy; he has been right too often in the past.

Even though we may disagree with H. G. Wells that this is the end of man's existence upon this planet, I think it would be well for us to examine in some detail the forces of disintegration and destruction at this moment let loose in the world.

I have referred to Adolph Hitler's prophecy that even if he fell he would pull down the world with him.

Hitler was one of the first to see the tremendous power of the totalitarian state with all its adjuncts and improvements of modern times. He saw in a flash of devilish insight that all the mighty power of a modern state could so easily be geared and meshed that radio, press, schools, art, science, etc., could serve the will of those in power. Hitler did that in Germany, Stalin has done it in Russia, and the idea is taking deep root all over the world. Indeed, these United States of ours have many would-be dictators who will out-Hitler Hitler if given the opportunity.

This is the first tremendous challenge facing the Christian Church: power developed to the nth degree as in the modern state.

The second menace is equally terrible: this gigantic power that has arisen overnight in the world, as it were, is an irresponsible power. It is irresponsible for the simple reason that our modern industrial age is so complicated that no man alive—be he ever so wise and clever—can predict with any degree of accuracy the result of any given policy. And the sad part about the world tragedy is that the men of power in the world are by no means the wisest of their kind. William Allen White, years ago, during the days of the New Deal, exactly summed up the qualities of those behind the scenes who run this nation of ours, when he wrote:

> It is silly to say that New Dealers run this show. It is largely run by absentee owners of amalgamated and industrial wealth who directly or through their employees control small minority blocks, closely organized, that manipulate the physical plants of these trusts. Also, for the most part, these managerial magnates whom one meets in Washington are decent Americans. For the most part they are giving to the American people superb service. They have great talents. If you touch them in nine relations of life out of ten, they are kindly, courteous gentlemen. But in the tenth relation, where it touches their own organizations, they are stark mad, ruthless, unchecked by God or man, paranoiacs, in fact, as evil in their designs as Hitler. They are determined to come out of this war victors for their own stockholders. This attitude of the men who control the great commodity industries and who propose to run them according to their own judgment and their own morals, does not make a pretty picture for the welfare of the common man. These international combinations of industrial capital are fierce troglodyte animals with tremendous social power and no social brains. They hover like old silurian reptiles over our decent, more or less, Christian civilization like dragons in this modern day when dragons are supposed to be dead.

"Troglodyte animals with tremendous social power and no social brains"! Let us not minimize this sinister aspect of our modern age. Anyone who knows his world realizes full well that mankind is in the grip of such troglodyte animals. Winston Churchill, in his latest writings concerning the origin of the Second World War, lifts the curtain now and then and reveals the utter stupidity of so many of the so-called statesmen of the world.

First, then, we face the tremendous menace of the modern state. Once men of the Hitler type get control, such a state immediately discards all moral and ethical values whatsoever and acts ruthlessly to keep in power those in control. Secondly, we face the troglodyte qualities of so many of the present rulers of the world. And, thirdly, we face a world where our whole society is conditioned for notoriety more than for human worth, and a cheap evanescent popularity is prized far more than sterling human qualities.

What one may call the Hollywood fixation is gripping vast multitudes of people the world over. Radio and press are geared to the task of splashing before untold millions a glamor and cheap sophistication that is demoralizing and stultifying to an amazing extent.

In the midst of it all, vast areas of common goodness and common talents remain unexplored. Yet therein lies our salvation. There is no salvation from the top downwards. The worth of a nation, or a civilization, lies in its homes and in its little churches, its community projects and communal enterprises.

We are hypnotized, misled, and bamboozled by so-called greatness and glamor. The lust for power and office and the desire to appear in the eyes of men as a superior person has been back of a great deal of the world's tragedy. The time has come for the true world lovers and servants of mankind to renounce once and for all this vain adulation of the so-called great.

As a matter of cold fact your so-called great man is a sham and a delusion. There are no truly great or full-orbed persons. All are human and as full of weaknesses as the rest of us. Some men, by a special attention to certain qualities with which they are endowed, climb to positions of power over the heads of their fellows. But this very one-sided development quickly makes them abnormal and more of a danger than a help to their fellows.

No man is great, that is to say, except in a very limited way. The greater he really is, the more he needs the poise and balance of his fellows. One of the worst things that can happen to an abnormally endowed person is for him to be set on a pedestal as a great man. Well did Jesus realize this when he said: "He that would be great among you, let him be as one that serves."

The very desire to become great and to lord it over one's fellows does something evil to a man. We see extreme examples of this in a Hitler, a Mussolini, or a Stalin. Yet our whole world psychology just now is conditioned to breed more and more of these grotesque figures, and only the true gospel of the Master can correct it.

In an Atomic Age we men of earth are being lured to the destruction of our whole civilization by the lust of power. The time is here for some group of people to lead the way in the opposite direction, toward a society of small communities where the worth and goodness of all men and women is fostered.

Because men are men, made of the same age-old stuff, all must be worthy of respect and love and service. I am of the people and I know them. I know them to be capable of the best. Men and women in the days to come may well look back with incredulity upon a world kow-towing to so-called exalted persons and prostrating itself before movie stars, industrial magnates, presidents, prime ministers, and the like. They will agree that they only are truly great who shall see themselves as one of many, at divers tasks and many occupations, weaving into a giant tapestry colors and designs none of which can be done without.

In every town and hamlet there are, as a matter of fact, plenty of people equally as capable as any that hold high office. Any of the most publicized individuals—be their talents what they may—can be duplicated many times over in any small town anywhere. Their name is legion. There are multitudes just as capable and just as talented as any who have caught the public eye. The misery of this idolization of "superior persons" lies in the fact that men of common clay are again and again expected to be better than they are.

We hear over the air prominent and talented persons and are tempted to ignore the fact that these people have no talent or knowledge that is in any way superior to that of multitudes whose voice or talent has never been heard. The sad fact has been that up to this moment in history we have been paying attention to the few and neglecting the many; and it is the many who are important and not the few. Happiness and dignity and human worth will arrive for all only when men turn their attention from adulation of the few, laugh them out of the picture, and devise means for human beings everywhere to live at their highest and their best.

Human excellence is one of the commonest of flowers to be found in any wayside dwelling from Burma to Cologne, from Nome to the Southern Continent. We men of this age of mass publicity and worship of the great have been warped and twisted in our ways of looking at life. We live in a world of bizarre propaganda where the abnormal, the superficially different, take our minds off the great mass of common people the world over who maintain our smirched dignity and human worth. To paraphrase John Milton: "A humanity not slow and dull, but of a quick, ingenious and piercing spirit, acute to invent, subtle and sinewy to discourse, not beneath the reach of any point, the highest that human capacity can soar to."

We followers of the lowly Nazarene are committed to a way of life diametrically opposed to the whole tempo of our modern life. We must never forget that he chose for his disciples a group of common and unlettered men who were just the forerunners of untold millions of Christians—common men and common women—who have brought to mankind whatever sweetness and light it now possesses. We have never taken seriously this gospel of Jesus.

Some of us—most of us, I think—did not visualize what a Second World War would do to mankind. We had the naive idea that once the enemy nations had surrendered we should go back to the status quo and pick up where we had left off. We did not take into account the fact that the aftermath of war—and especially such a colossal war as we have just concluded—is perhaps more destructive than the war itself. It has let loose in the world germs of hatred and greed and lust for power that will surely destroy us unless we can discover a spiritual inoculation capable of neutralizing what has been let loose.

This spiritual substance capable of saving us is none other than Jesus's doctrine of the kingdom, unadulterated and without compromise. It is not an easy way out. For nine hundred and ninety nine out of one thousand it will sound like the vain babblings of a dreamer and an idealist. It may well be that not a single person who reads this article will see anything in it that appeals to him. Nonetheless, I insist that soon or late, it is the way that a newly awakened remnant of mankind will finally take out of threatening chaos and destruction.

Says the Wise Fool in one of Shakespeare's plays: "Let go thy hold when the Great Wheel goes crashing downhill, lest it crush thee in its path." It seems plainly evident to me that our civilization is crashing downhill and that it is entirely incapable of guidance or control. Those of us who are convinced of this still have the opportunity to let go our hold upon the present order and be at least a remnant to survive and pass on to the generations yet unborn the high values of our Christian heritage.

We must be crystal clear about certain things. The first is that under no circumstances whatsoever do we want to support the tendency towards the totalitarian state that we see all around us. We must, as far as possible, let go our hold upon our increasingly fascist order of society. Like-minded Christians can gather themselves together in small communities and take from their shoulders, as far as possible, any need for centralized control.

There is a decided tendency toward the totalitarian system of centralized authority not only in politics and industry but in religion as well. We face a Roman Catholic Church that is the embodiment of totalitarianism and centralized authority. And it seems to me that the Protestant churches are beginning to have the idea that only a strong, centralized, united Protestantism can adequately face and combat the growing power of the Roman Catholic Church.

In my opinion, that way madness lies. Look where we will these days we feel the crushing weight of centralized organization run by men whose allegiance to the teachings of Jesus regarding the kingdom is weak and distant, to say the least. In Russia the church just now is an adjunct and assistant of the state. And do not let us suppose for one moment that what has happened in Russia cannot happen here.

Let the tendency toward totalitarianism develop in this country, as it shows every sign of doing, and all organized religion, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, will find itself exactly in the position of the church in Russia. In many ways today we face a situation very similar to that which the early church faced. In those days the Romans demanded that everyone worship the Emperor as a god. Today, to an ever increasing degree, we are being asked to submit to the tendency to centralized control.

The answer of the early Christians was to refuse to submit their souls to the pagan dominance of Rome. The cry was: "Come ye out from her and be ye separate." It seems to me that our cry—if we are to save ourselves from what Herbert Spencer, long years ago, predicted would be "the rebarbarization of society"—must be somewhat similar. We must find ways and means to take off the great weights imposed by our totalitarian society, and strengthen by all means in our power small community life and the good life among such small communities.

We are so close to this new radio, movie, Hollywood type of existence that we scarcely realize what it is doing to us and our children. But as a matter of sober fact we are rapidly becoming a Western civilization of spectators, listeners, pattern-types of the vast propaganda in which we are deluged every day of our lives.

Two of the sayings of Jesus have been running through my mind continually as I have been thinking of the preparation of this article. One of these sayings is "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." The other is "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you."

Regarding the first, I am wondering whether Jesus did not take a long look down the centuries and foresee the day when perhaps a final Armageddon would destroy the pagan order of society now rapidly coming into being. And whether he did not also foresee a remnant who had previously organized their lives upon

his kingdom way so that they might finally inherit the earth.

What do I mean by the gathered church in the gathered community? I mean that perhaps the time is here for Christians to cease talking about the good life and begin to practice it. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you."

This, then, is the challenge. Small groups of Christians who see the handwriting on the wall must get themselves together in small communities in all nations wherever Christians or any other groups of men of good will can be found. Their religious faith will at one and the same time be their social and industrial way of doing things. They will as far as possible be communities where money has little or no value and where economic dependence upon the state is nonexistent.

On this fair earth of ours there is a superabundance for all who care to live the good life and share all that can be produced so abundantly. In these new types of gathered communities, functioning at one and the same time as churches and as communities, the weight also of all that perverts and pollutes the life of the individual and especially the child by radio and movie would be removed. These new groups gathered to try out in actual life whether Jesus' kingdom is really sane and practical would have their lives filled to overflowing with arts and crafts and the best joys of communal enterprises so that the cult of what may be called the world of entertainment—listening to the radio, watching cheap movies, etc.,—would have no place in these new groups.

I can see no place in these new groupings, founded and grounded upon the ethics of Christ's kingdom, for professionalism, private property, or even a paid ministry. Rightly organized and using all the best techniques of agriculture there would be enough and to spare for everybody. As a matter of fact the time is here when by the use of atomic power there will be no need of huge, nation-wide, interlocking industries and the dependence of the rest of the country upon them. By the use of the inventions now at hand—many of the best of our inventions have been bought up and suppressed by interested industrialists—and the added use of atomic power, it is logical to foresee a vast decentralization going on all over the world and the use for centralized control becoming less and less.

It is very necessary that we Christians, who believe in the common man and in the priesthood of the common man, should take into account the logic of events. Christians the world over, did they but realize it, are in themselves the framework and the beginning of the worldwide kingdom of God.

The nation as a unit is obsolete. It is time it was bowed out of the picture. A beginning can be made in this direction by what I call the gathered churches in the gathered communities. These will be the chain of lights binding mankind together in the gathering darkness. Their allegiance will be to the world fellowship of men and women of good will. They will begin a real missionary movement by seeking out, under the noses of the dictators and the dictator states, all those like-minded groups willing to renounce allegiance to whatever in their nation is working against world brotherhood and a world commonwealth.

There will come up the question, of course, of paying tribute to Caesar. Shall these new gathered communities and churches refuse aid to all taxes used for war or preparations for war? They will be pacifist groups; they will be the meek destined, they or their descendants, to inherit the earth. War is essentially evil; it has no redeeming points whatever; it is never justified under any conditions. Therefore these new gathered communities must refuse to have anything whatever to do with war in any shape or form.

These small gathered communities which are at the same time gathered churches will be looking forward to men of all races becoming one in spirit. They will mix their constituency with men and women of other colors and nations. A small proportion will always be travelling from one nation to another and beginning to form the new world fellowship in which intermarriage and intermingling of men and women of different colors will be the accepted procedure.

In this way there shall slowly come into being a world faith. No messenger from God wants people to fight over his name. Not he who nameth the name, but he who doeth the deed. If Jesus were here amongst us in days like these I imagine that he would speak to us in words like these:

> I ask you not to look *to* me but *with* me. Let ours be the kinship of fellow-workers at the same great task. Who loves what I love, renders me the only love I crave. Let no one be diverted from the task by adoration of me. Who most forgets me because of absorption in our task, he, whether he know it or not, is most nearly one with me.

There are untold millions in the world today who are arriving at conclusions such as I have outlined. They come from many backgrounds and many of them from much cruder civilizations than our own. They will be able to enter the kingdom of God from different doors and their lips will never frame their faith in our terms. But verily these new groups of gathered communities, each living the life of the kingdom and not just talking about it, will form the first frail framework of the gathered world church and the gathered world community.

Some day, near or far, we shall see the captains and the kings depart. There will be the full sweep of the pendulum from the condition of affairs as we see it in the world today. The common man will come into his long-delayed birthright. Every man and every woman shall be a newborn bard of the Holy Ghost. John Bunyan's old woman, sitting in the sun, and talking of God, will be of far more significance for human happiness than all the charts of creeds, the outworn theologies, and the like.

I ask you, do you believe that the meek shall inherit the earth? Do you believe that if we seek first his kingdom, then all other things shall be added unto us? Do you believe that men shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks? Do you believe that God hath made men of one blood on all the face of the earth? Of course you believe all this. These are the most real things that men have believed since time began. But men have believed them half-heartedly, faintly, from afar off.

Today the desperate urgency of the situation may stir some of us, ere too long, into beginning to live our faith and not just talk about it.

> For the vision is yet for the appointed time,
> And it hasteneth to the end, and shall not lie.
> Though it tarry, wait for it:
> Because it will surely come; it will not fail.

Semantics and Tradition

SHELDON SHEPARD

Donald Laneer was a young and active physician. He was especially interested in phases of his professional life which kept him moving about, and was also engaged in amateur athletics. Then he was stricken with polio, which resulted in paralysis in both legs and arms. For days he lay thinking of the changes to be made in his life now that he must be as nearly helpless as paralyzed arms and legs would make him. Soon, however, he and attending physicians and nurses discovered that paralysis was rapidly disappearing from one side. Indications were that one side, one arm and leg, would be as good as ever, and that he would have slight use of the other arm and leg.

Years later, in telling of this experience, the doctor said:

> "Well, when that change came in the prognosis, and from contemplation of a life circumscribed by useless limbs, I began to plan activities with a good leg and a good arm, and a second pair somewhat helpful, I experienced one of the supreme thrills of my life. From the imprisonment into which I had been cornered, I began to think of work I could do, of new plans of operation, of tricks that I could manage to make things do better."

And he reported that not only in the anticipation of those days, but through the years that followed he found thrilling experiences of activity and growth. And now, thirty-five years later he says:

> "All through these thirty-five years, I have undertaken life as an exploration. I have been constantly engaged in the wonder and the reaching-out of seeing what I could do. It has been a great and wonderful time. Not that the conditions of paralysis are what I would order, but simply that I have found thirty-five years of exciting and happy experience. Maybe the real reason is that for days I lived in expectation that I should have to plan my life without a useful limb."

Would it not be a valuable experiment, if each of us could in some way or other draw himself aside, withdraw from the pattern of his ordinary living, become detached, and look into the scenes in which ordinarily he moves as though he were not in them? It would be a fine creative experience of imagination to put yourself at one side and look at life without you in it, seeing there no expression of yourself, no projection of your personality, nothing out there that is you, or your action, or relationships. Then, how wonderingly we could see what an adventure it is to step from this corner of detachment and tread again the roadway that leads to all possible experiences.

It may be that we have all had slight samples of such a view. When we have been confined to the house for a period, how splendid it has been to sit outside in the easy chair in the sun for the first time. What an adventure, what a thrill, to take the first walk around the block! What an exploration of our strength and a building of its resources. Maybe you have sometimes found yourself limited because of lack of employment or professional or vocational expression. After the uncertainty, monotony, and drabness, you took a job, you started to work, you began to deal with duties and people involved. What a pleasure to get going again.

Life is exploration. Life is a vast and thrilling adventure. And every day has as much potency in it, as much potentiality for that splendid exultation, as the first day you were able to get out of the house after illness, as the first day you went to work after being a long time unemployed. Every day is life, and life is a sublime reaching out into the unknown, into the future with all its possibilities. This characteristic of our lives, that we cannot tell what is going to happen next day, next year, we have distorted into a thing of fear and a burden on our hearts. It should be the beckoning finger of the gods. Come on out into the next minute. Come on into tomorrow. Come on into your new kingdom, your new realm of capacity. That is what it really is. Join the sweep of the mighty procession of the changing centuries in which nothing is static. All things move on in the sweep of eternal destiny. My! what a tremendous thing it is and what we have done to it.

One of the main points of the semantic approach is recognition of the appeal of the march of life, of its progression, of its going-on-ness. It is a breaking of the shells of the static, the conventional, the traditional, the established, the set, the ungrowing. It is a liberating of our hearts and minds, to make them as free as the wings of angels playing with the moving currents of all things in their changing progression.

This is one of the ways in which childhood is the kingdom of God; one of the ways in which it is true that except as ye are as little children ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom. Childhood is the age of exploration and adventure. When most of the child's experiences are interpreted by his lips and tongue, everything goes into his mouth. A little later when he wishes to explore everything by its touch, he reaches out and cries for you to hand him the moon so he can explore it in terms of these new standards he is discovering. He wants now to taste and feel everything, including the fire and knives and pins and hundred dollar vases. But from his side of the experience it is a natural and exciting adventure. When he comes to adolescence he begins to feel the winds of a new world in his face. Every adolescent wants to run away from home and go around the world. It is natural, normal. Do not worry about him if he does; begin to be concerned about his future if he does not. Of course he feels himself repressed, held down. One of the high functions of home and school and church is to let children, especially adolescents, feel that they are being led out into adventure. We are failures when we make any child, and again especially an adolescent, feel that he is being hemmed in. A teacher who can handle a subject in Junior High School in such a way that the child feels that he is exploring it is a great teacher. No matter what other qualifications he may have, a teacher who handles any subject in such a way that the adolescent feels bottled up, shut in, and restricted is contributing to the youth's failure to develop a wholesome personality.

Religion should be the acme of expressions of freedom. It should be the strongest apostle of liberty. It should be to every person a revelation of his capacities, his worth and his freedom. Religion should not be a ham-stringing of the personality, fastening chains about the soul with such injunctions as these: "No. You can't do that; God is watching. That is natural, but not right. No. You must not let your mind soar free with doubts. Do not question. No. These are our rules." Religion rather should guarantee the child the freedom his mind gropes for. "Yes", it cries, "raise all the questions you

can. Find every flaw that is in what your church tells you, and your teacher, your Bible, and every other source. The sacred thing is your search! The holy adventure is your exploration after truth and life."

In the adult world, science is the best example of the understanding of progressing life, of the spirit of adventure. It peers into everything—a Dr. Carver looking into the peanut and finding unexpected wealth for the South—a Dr. Miller looking into the sweet potato and discovering another mine of untold wealth. Science, exploring into the atom and finding something there that sends shivers into the hearts of every intelligent human being. But also with it the trembling notes of a beginning song of the day of plenty for all. Science reaching out from its world supposed to be the center of the universe and exploring millions of galaxies and systems, and light-years of distances, standing enthralled at the sublimity of its view. That is an approach to life that is semantic and correct. It understands the changing, progressing nature of existence. It sweeps along with the tide of the centuries toward the harbors of destiny.

These are the attitudes essential for the individual good life. Without them, all other benefits are caught in whirling eddies of conflicting life-forces. No matter how fast the individual seems to be going, he does not advance with the stream of his true and full richness.

Semantics for the individual is primarily the setting of his life into these attitudes, the application of the spirit of progression, of adventure, with an attempt to discover more and more of the nature of the world, more and more of our own natures, and to practice more and more of harmony with the structural nature of all these. Semantics is a kind of stairway from the level of individual relationships to the high level of scientific approach. It invites each to intelligent, harmonious scientific living in harmony with his own nature and the structure of the stage of existence on which he plays his part. This alone offers to an individual, to a nation, to the race the solution of problems, the answers to questions, the blasting away of the barriers blocking the way to the goal.

It is a kind of attempt to make an individual at home in the world in which he lives. A maladjusted and unhappy person, a failure, is not at home in this world which is his home. It is not a place in which being at home consists in sitting in front of the fireplace in a comfortable chair and letting the rest of the world go by. If one sits emotionally or ideologically in an easy chair of mental indifference and lets the world go by for the next five years, when he wakes and looks about him, the world will have passed him by. He will be a stranger in a strange land, further away from being at home than ever. We have to have the going-on look. We have to have the forward-facing. We must have the dynamic action of change and adjustment. We must constantly be fitting ourselves, not into words, not into ideologies we have heard, not into old patterns, not into the beating of advertisement and propaganda upon us, not into the shapes presented by teachers and preachers, but into the grand sweep of life as it drives on toward its goal.

This is the kind of attitude by which one can be sure that he is not distorting his personality out of harmony with the Creator's structural intent. Immediately he discovers any distortion, he changes his attitude. Tradition says: "Here is the map we have drawn of life. Accept it without examination, follow it." Freedom says: "Look at life and see what it is like. Then map out your course." Tradition demands that we live year after year without changing our ideas, and no mind can reach its fullest development in such a process.

Tradition is out of harmony with the structure of the personality and of our world. Damage is wrought upon us by tradition, by "the good old days," by established doctrine, by voices of a thousand years ago accepted as final. These are gnawing away at the nature of the heart which requires that man should look forward and be reaching out. Our structure demands that we be growing and that our first love shall be the future.

The Making of Robert Burns

LEONARD B. GRAY

High society in Edinburgh in the winter of 1786-87, as high society has everywhere and always, was seeking a new thrill, and it found its desired thrill in the poet Robert Burns whose reputation by means of a volume of poems he had published the previous summer in Kilmarnock arrived in the city before he did. The new sensation was all the more exciting to the learned, the wealthy, and the aristocratic because it was in the form of a ploughman poet. Had he come from London or from some other great city or from their own great university their surprise and thrill would not have been so great. But they had asked: "Can anything good come out of Ayrshire?" And now because such original and exciting poetry, such evidences of rare genius, and such a magnetic and striking personality had so suddenly appeared in their midst from Ayrshire and the plough and the unlearned and out of dire poverty, they put a halo of glory around the poet's head, tumbled over one another in seeking him out and inviting him to dine, and in lionizing him as if he were a specimen of humanity such as had never come into their world before. They did not seem to realize that there are no stipulated and restricted places and circumstances for the production of prophets and poets. It was hard for them to understand that a poet may appear anywhere and that this particular poet had come from one of the best life-situations for the making of poets. The very severe circumstances in which Burns was placed, the very hard struggles he had experienced in making a livelihood, and the very misfortunes that had attended him in the early years of his life—and that in the opinions of many Edinburgh people would keep a man from being an unusual poet even if he had some genius in him—were some of the best factors in making him the poet he was. And since that exciting winter in the Athens of the North many people have not quite realized this. Most readers of this poet's works and most writers about him have marvelled that such a great poet could come out of his hard circumstances and from this they have gone on to mourn the lack of more and greater poems they claim he would have

produced had his conditions of living been easier. But we are out to claim that Burns' hard lot in life was just the lot to assist rather than obstruct his genius, and that he became the great poet he did not despite but to a great extent because of his hard lot. After saying that many people make certain external conditions, certain sort of training, bred in a certain rank, confidential footing with the higher classes, and seeing the world, necessary requirements for the making of a poet, Carlyle goes on to write:

> As to seeing the world, we apprehend this will cause him little difficulty, if he have but an eye to see it with. Without eyes, indeed, the task might be hard. But happily every poet is born into the world, and sees it, with or against his will, every day and every hour he lives. The mysterious workmanship of man's heart, the true light and inscrutable darkness of man's destiny, reveal themselves not only in capital cities and crowded saloons, but in every hut and hamlet where men have their abode.

Scotland needed a great poet to give expression to the typically Scottish life in the Scottish dialect. It had had two very worthy and popular poets, Allan Ramsay 1686-1758, and Robert Fergusson 1750-1774, who wrote faithfully to nature and about Scottish humble life and in the vernacular of the common people of their country, but they were not quite major and are considered today chiefly as forerunners of Burns who fullfilled his country's need of a great poet. Ramsay and Fergusson had much to do in the making of our poet, for as a boy the latter read his two forerunners diligently and modeled many of his earlier verses on their works. Of Fergusson young Burns was particularly fond and modestly wrote of him:

> O Thou, my elder brother in misfortune,
> By far my elder brother in the muse.

But only for a short time did Burns imitate his two predecessors as well as some of the great English poets whom he widely read in his boyhood. There was a strong original, independent bent to his genius that went its own unique way, and this genius we cannot explain. The best we can do is to mention and describe some of the influences that stimulated and shaped and directed this genius.

Nature, we believe, set this genius in one of the best places and surrounded it with some of the best circumstances, despite their severity, for its flowering. The poet came from a family of farmers and gardeners, and he was born on the 25th of January, 1759, at Alloway, not far from the town of Ayr which was to become one of the chief centers of his short life. On farms at Alloway, Mount Oliphant, and Locklie, the father, William Burness, and his sturdy sons fought a hard fight for a living on poor soil and against oppressive landowners from whom they rented their land; and for the sons, after the death of their father at Locklie, this hard fight continued at Mossgiel. Hard labor and poverty brought about the father's premature death, and so injured the health of Robert, his eldest son, as to do much in bringing about the latter's early death on July 21, 1796, at the age of thirty-seven.

Even though little, the schooling Robert received was under excellent teachers and did much to develop in him a taste for great literature and to make him a reasonably good writer of prose. This little and fine schooling was so augmented by splendid teaching from his father and by the boy's wide reading as to make the frequent claim that the poet was unlearned altogether unjustified. Young Burns' unfortunate love affairs and fornications, however regrettable and inexcusable as such, were to play their parts in the making of him as a poet. The publication of his first volume of poems at Kilmarnock, a few miles from Mossgiel where he was living at the time, brought him sudden fame, a few guineas to relieve his poverty, and enthusiastic recognition from proud Edinburgh. After two triumphant and happy winters in that great city the poet settled as a farmer at Ellisland where he augmented his meager living from the soil with the work of Exciseman. The latter became his only means of livelihood in Dumfries where he lived a few years before his death.

And what brought about the premature death of the poet? We cannot accept the frequent claim that poverty, immorality, and drink brought him to his early grave. At the worst, we believe, they were contributing causes only to a small degree. Not a few persons afflicted with these ills have lived long lives. Besides while immoral at times Burns never abused himself at brothels, and while he occasionally drank to excess he was not a drunkard.

Carlyle seems to have some good reason to claim that the internal maladjustment that destroyed the poet's happiness and psychological health was indirectly the main cause of his early death. Burns was mentally and emotionally maladjusted to most of the circumstances that surrounded him. His vehement part on the side of the new light movement in the religious controversary raging at the time awakened in the mind of the young man serious doubts as to the worth of religion itself. With the basic principles that had hitherto unified and supported him weakened as far as he was concerned and with his yielding to his "passions raging like demons" within him, he lost both a guiding influence and a sense of innocence. Wild desire and wild repentance alternating in him, his mind became divided. His two triumphant winters in Edinburgh, despite the joy and happiness they gave him for a time, probably did him more lasting harm than good in that they made him more keenly aware of economic and social inequalities and aroused in him a jealous, indignant fear of social degradation. From that time he was divided between desire for a larger share of the material good things and his love of writing poetry, between worldly ambitions and his true self out of which his great early poetry had burst so spontaneously. His efforts to maintain an impossible friendly union between a worldly spirit and the spirit of poetry destroyed his mental health and his morale. This lack of unity and consistency in his purposes for a number of years finally brought the man to such a maladjusted condition of mind that there were but three gates of deliverance: clear poetical activity which would restore his lost unity, madness, or death. Unable to take sufficient command of himself to enter the first, Burns escaped the second through a speedy death.

All this Carlyle claims, but we will have to call Burns' internal maladjustment a contributing rather than the main cause of his death if we accept what medical men now generally believe, namely, that it was rheumatic endocarditis largely brought about by hard farm labor in early life that brought the poet's life to its early end.

How pathetic! It was a hard, short life with many hardships and misfortunes, many mistakes and follies, many sorrows relieved by few joys, many failures with few successes as the world counts success, strangely

mixed, that Scotland's purest genius and greatest poet lived! And yet how much has that hard, short life through its very severe experiences, as it could not through easy experiences, we believe, enriched mankind!

Of course we would not wish his heavy drudgery on the farm upon Burns even for the sake of his poetry and the enrichment we are privileged to get through his poetry. In fact, this is one of the many hard facts in his life that arouses our compassion for the unfortunate man. Yet his drudgery gave him an identification with his work, a knowledge of farm life, and a sympathy for laborers and beasts out of which came much of his great poetry. It is highly probable that an easier work would not have given him his knowledge and emotional reactions, without which he could not have written in the strong and realistic way he did.

The poverty and the social distinctions and the oppressions felt so keenly by this proud and highly sensitive man and his almost constant discontent with his lot developed in him a hatred for the cruel and arrogant wealthy classes and aroused him to write great poetry against the injustices that hurt and frustrated him and many of his fellowmen so severely. Had he been rich or even well-to-do and reasonably contented, it is extremely unlikely that he would have been aroused to put into his poetry the great social messages that the world needs.

Of course we cannot excuse Burns' fornications, yet the wrath and persecution from the church that these follies of the poet brought upon him aroused him to hate and to write against some of the evils in the church. It seems that the Kirk treated him with reasonable leniency according to its custom at the time. But in such an aroused condition of mind against the church he saw in the church not only what he imagined to be a wrong attitude towards him but also some evils and distorted values which he probably would not have seen so vividly had he not been so keenly aroused by the treatment he received from the church. And out of his bitter feelings against the church he wrote great poetry that did the necessary task of ridiculing and condemning religious stupidity, intolerance, and bigotry and at the same time gave keen insights into genuine religion. Robert Burns lives in history while the leaders of those Kirk sessions are either forgotten or else remembered only for their persecutions of the poet not only because he had genius and they did not, but also because in his greater love for humanity and keener insights into essential religious values he was really more Christian than they.

Most of the biographers of our poet have lamented the fact that "poor Burns," as they call him, did not have more leisure for study and writing and we have joined their wail at times. With many others we have cried, "Oh, if only Burns had had the leisure of Goethe and Wordsworth and some other great poets, think of the greater heights he would have attained in Poetry!" There is some likelihood that had he had more freedom from the struggle of making a living he would have produced more and greater poems than he did. Yet we are not so sure. It often happens that people with lots of leisure carelessly waste it while those who have little time for what they chiefly want to do are incited to treasure all the more their dominant interests and to make the most of the few hours they can snatch from necessary and unpleasant tasks. We suspect that Burns belonged to the latter. Despite the almost constant demand for him at dinners and balls during his two winters in Edinburgh he had a better chance to take himself in hand and to give himself to his beloved poetry than at any other time in his life, but he did not do so. The singular fact is that he wrote most of his great poetry when there were the most unavoidable demands made upon him.

More time for writing, fewer hardships, and more peace of mind would have meant, his biographers claim, more and greater creative works on the part of Burns. T. F. Henderson wrote this about the poet: "It is at least allowable to suppose that, in circumstances more easy and congenial, the poetical achievements of his later years would have been much more substantial." But look at the facts. Do they not show that Henderson and many others had no reason for their guessing? The most creative period in the poet's life occurred during the six months of the winter of 1785-6. No other period of similar length in his life equaled this in quality and amount of poetical productivity. Indeed this period equals, if not surpasses, in creative work the whole remainder of his life. Besides hard manual labor on the farm that left him little time for anything else, his worldly perplexities during this period were worse than at any other time in his life. Jean Armour was with child by him. Her father was bringing legal action against him. The Kirk was censuring him for his fornications. Cornered by hard circumstances, he was planning to leave his beloved Scotland forever and to go to the West Indies, a thing he hated to do. He was mourning the death of his beloved Highland Mary to whom he had been betrothed. The hard-pressed and tormented fellow must have been in a mental hell. Yet at that very time and in that wretched mental condition there poured forth from his mind and heart a huge flood of intense, passionate poetry which for both quality and quantity has perhaps never been equaled by any other poet in the same length of time.

How can we explain this? A coincidence is not likely the explanation. Nor was the fact that the poet needed and sought an escape in writing the main reason. Nor can we believe that the storm blew itself out in this period, as some claim. Burns was too young for this to happen. Great creative periods while often short are seldom as short as this one. Rather, we believe, that there was never again in his life sufficient intensity of reaction to circumstances, the greatest cause of creative work, to produce another such storm. The hardest circumstances in his life incited his greatest emotional reaction to circumstances and this in turn incited him to write his greatest poems and his largest quantity of poetry.

Most of Burns' poetry was written about his immediate environment and about circumstances that aroused him the most at the time of his writing. How then do we explain his writing of his great poem, "The Cotter's Saturday Night," in this great creative period? Obviously this poem was written about conditions of life that did not arouse him at this time as much as most of the conditions he wrote about at this time. We explain the writing of this poem by the psychological fact that when one is aroused and heightened by any circumstances one is stirred to do his best writing even when what he writes about may not arouse him at the time so much as some other circumstances. When one is greatly keyed up he

writes about any subject he may tackle with great intensity. And so, hard conditions in his immediate environment at this period aroused the intensity of mind and heart in Burns that produced his greatest poetry no matter what the conditions of life he wrote about.

The few poems Burns wrote during his first triumphant and happy winter in Edinburgh were much inferior to his best work. He produced very little poetry during the following summer when he made his carefree tours over various parts of the country, and during his second happy winter in Edinburgh. The experiences of his latter years in Ellisland and Dumfries, while certainly hard enough, were easy compared to his harrying experiences in Massgiel during the winter of 1785-6, and yet his great songs and his few great poems, with the possible exception of one or two, of these latter years, do not equal his wonderful productions of those great six months we have just been discussing. We see then that history is greatly indebted not only to the genius of Burns, but also to the severe circumstances that stimulated his genius to such great flowering.

It is almost certain that no matter what the life-situations of Burns might have been his genius would have burst forth in some sort of poetry even as his irresistible charm that broke through the clods of his poor economic and social advantages and won the adoration and friendship of the learned and aristocratic could not help making itself felt anywhere. Early in life in one of his poems he asked for nature's fire. He need not have done so. It was freely given him and to no other more abundantly. Burns was sheer genius. He was brilliancy itself, more brilliant in his conversation than in his poetry, some said, and that was saying a lot. But it seems quite evident that had the conditions that surrounded him been different from what they were his poetry would not have contained the superb pictures of Scottish peasant life and the strong passion for genuine religion and social righteousness for which we are so much indebted. There is no point in wishing that he had had the leisure of Goethe and Wordsworth since leisure was quite necessary for the writing of the philosophical poems that these two poets produced, whereas the kind of poetry Burns produced is more likely to come out of hectic and disturbed living. We believe that the peculiar genius of this Scottish poet would not have responded so vehemently to any other circumstances than what surrounded him most of his life. What is inside certain men responds best, it seems, to certain peculiar circumstances. Wordsworth speaks of the crowded cities as not meant for him and it is hard to imagine London calling forth from his peculiar type of mind and temperament the great poetry that his beloved hills called forth. Robert Frost lived in many environments but he never to any great degree responded to any of them as a poet save the New England hill country. Apparently the sea, even though he lived within sight or easy distance of it most of his life, made no great impression upon Burns since he seldom wrote about it. He wrote no great poetry in Edinburgh because, there, we believe, he was out of his true element for writing. Of any man one might take, Emerson wrote: "Not for nothing one face, one character, one fact, makes such an impression on him, and another none. The eye was placed where one ray might fall, that it might testify of that particular ray."

So the poet must have his environment. He must have his experiences and none other. We cannot believe that his life is prearranged as those who hold the doctrine of predestination do, or even determined in the way Spinoza would claim. But we do claim that nature can make her poets only in her own ways and that she had no other way of making Burns the poet he became save the way she did. His hard circumstances, however much we regret them, were necessary to his great poetic achievements. He suffered for his art and through his art for the enrichment of his readers. Let us then bemoan his hard positions in life and his ill-fortunes for his sake, not for ours.

What is more, let us not hang our heads and say "poor Burns" too much. Despite and amid his many ill fortunes and agonies of spirit our poet had his high moments of joy. He had many friends among all classes. He knew the deep joys of true love for men and of true love for women. He had two happy, glorious winters in Edinburgh. He spent many hours at delightful parties, dinners, and dances. No man gave or found more fun, laughter, and zest at social affairs. If he appeared at some inn late at night people would get out of their beds and come down for the fits of laughter into which they knew his humor, wit, and fascinating stories would send them. Indeed, he was a man of supreme fun, joy, and song. Above all, he knew the incomparable joy of creative work.

There remains for us to ask: What did Burns put into his intense poetry that was so impassioned by his genius and by both his hard and happy experiences? He put into his poetical productions wild and flinging and exhilarating joy of living, mournful and pathetic reactions to "the slings and arrows of circumstance," ardent feelings of friendship, passionate and tender love, charming and delightful pictures of rural life, warm compassion for unfortunate men and beasts, daring attacks against sham and injustice, and keen insights into genuine religion such as have seldom, if ever, been surpassed in the poetry of the human race. We have read no one who slammed harder and sharper scorn and ridicule at the shams, stupidities, hypocrisies, distorted values, bigotries, and cruelties found in religion with the possible exception of Voltaire whom Burns read and greatly admired. It is delightful beyond words to note how he can make people laugh at the petty and irrelevant and distorted in religion. At the same time no one saw with keener eye the true, the genuine, and the essential in religion. He was a great poet of economic justice and social righteousness. His onslaughts against unjust landlords are terrific. He showed up the imbecilities and silly prides of many of the rich and arrogant against the white light of true manly worth. His touch was sure and deft with a rare power to say a lot in a few words. For instance, with a few master strokes in a short poem such as "For a' that and a' that" he makes us see the dignity and worth of man more vividly than the great Emerson could in a long essay. With penetrating eye he saw the fundamentals and simplicities of life beneath the outworn conventions and accretions that men accumulate. Liberalism today is greatly indebted for many of its essential values to this great liberal poet. Robert Burns remains one of the great poets of true religion, of simple living, and of democracy and humanity.

Psychiatry and Religion

PHILIP SCHUG

The fields of psychiatry and religion are very close together in one respect and very far apart in another. They are close together in that they both deal with the very real but intangible factors of the psyche, with motive and conscience and social and personal influences. But they are far apart in their methods and assumptions. Psychiatry starts from the point of view of empirical science and assumes that it is dealing with ideas and psychological forces. Religion, for the most part, starts from a non-scientific or loosely philosophical point of view and assumes that it is dealing with external realities called spirits, gods, demons, etc.

Since this is an age of dawning science, people are more likely to value highly the authority of the psychiatrist than the priest when it comes to really serious problems involving the psyche. This causes a jealousy on the part of some religious leaders, who either try to become competent in this field or try to wean some psychiatrists over to their side of the fence. Being able to offer audiences and considerable royalties some psychiatrists do spend quite a bit of effort to be conciliatory—and they are usually badly misquoted by religious leaders who take selected quotations to bolster their own points of view. Naturally some confusion results.

This confusion has surrounded the works of Carl Gustav Jung, who wrote a best seller in the 1930s, called *Modern Man in Search of a Soul.*

Because he is one of the three pioneers in psychiatry I consider it important to see what he really does consider the relations between psychiatry and religion to be.

Let us first turn to his understanding of religion and the psychological factors of life. Jung tries to make it very clear that the psychological factors in life are real and very important. Most of us will admit this abstractly, but when it comes to paying close attention to our consciences, our flashes of intuition, our dreams and other evidences of mental life on the fringes of consciousness we shy away. These things are not first class. We do not like to admit that certain things just seem to happen to us that are outside the realm of our will and desire. Yet Jung insists that we must pay attention to them, for they are important.

To tie these things into religion it is only necessary to look back in history to see what a large part these rather mysterious forces of our mental life have played in religion. People not long ago considered dreams, visions and sudden intuitive insights as the voice of God and various saints—or of devils, as the case may be. Jung argues that religion in all cultures has always been characterized by a careful consideration and observation of these dynamic factors, which religious people have interpreted as spirits, demons, gods, eternal laws, etc. The development of creeds and rituals have been efforts to control the experiences that people have had with these forces, for left to themselves people would develop many and various interpretations, but under the guidance of a church they outlaw some of those experiences and channel others so that the group does not split constantly and the institutional ends of the church are served. People do not necessarily need to understand the creeds nor the ritual in order to be controlled by them. In every society, of course, there are those who cannot be brought under control. They insist upon their right to have their own religious experiences. "The village atheist" is a good example of this individualism.

Now that it is obvious that religion has always dealt with the same psychic factors that pschiatry now deals with, let us turn to Jung's evaluation of these efforts.

The first thing we can say is that Jung has a high respect for the ability that religious people have shown in dealing with these factors of raw psychical or "religious" experience. The individual left alone is very vulnerable to the influence of these experiences. Religious institutions have been able to shelter him from their destructive force by providing idea systems and controls.

But religious institutions have made the same mistakes in their basic assumptions that people in general have made when they insisted upon the external nature of these psychic forces. Thus, as a second observation, we find that they have acquired a vested interest in materialistic and grossly objective interpretations of these psychological factors in life. They have their gods, devils, angels, and other such explanations for these psychic forces. There is nothing surprising about this. Everybody was making such interpretations when they acquired these explanations. We know them very simply as projections. But the fact is that they are now stuck with these explanations.

This came about simply because their people have withdrawn these projections so far as the content of their "unconscious" psychic activity is concerned. Thus they leave the religious institutions in the unenviable position of being forced to openly support ideas that the people really do not believe in the depths of their consciousness. This may not be obvious to many of you, and if it is not it is due to the fact that Jung finds this abandonment of the gods, devils, and other spirits not on the conscious and logical level but on the level of psychic activity that is on the periphery of consciousness which cannot be controlled by an act of the will. Jung makes the assertion that in his practice he has never had a patient who was an exception to this regardless of how openly devout he may have seemed, and he concluded that it is general among Western man.

The question arises as to what they do place at the center of their psychic life if it is not these projections —and the answer is "themselves." To him this means that in their depths they recognize their own responsibility for the affairs of men, and I suggest that this would not be a bad thing to bring into full consciousness.

The Study Table

Importance of Understanding

KNOWING AND THE KNOWN. *By John Dewey and Arthur F. Bentley. Boston: Beacon Press. 334 pp. $4.00.*

My suggestion is that most readers will do well to read the Preface and Introduction of this volume (about two pages each) and then turn to the Appendix. It is in the form of a personal letter from Dewey to a colleague, unnamed, who has proposed a number of questions based, I suppose, upon a manuscript copy of the book. The letter was written after the book itself was in type, but fortunately the letter is included. In the letter the genial and kindly philosopher undertakes to tell his friend what the authors of the book really have been trying to do. Mr. Dewey is anxious for his friend to understand fully the position the authors have taken, even though such understanding may "convert your difficulty and doubt into outright rejection. But, after all, rejection based on understanding is better than apparent agreement based on misunderstanding." I am sure that what he has said to his friend he would gladly say to each reader of the book. He might even like to have each reader substitute himself or herself in the place of the friend to whom the letter is written, as he says: "I should be happy, indeed, dear A————, to obtain your assent to my view; but failing that, I shall be quite content if I can obtain an understanding of what it is that my theory of inquiry is trying to do."

A little more of John Dewey himself may be advisable for the average reader before he tackles the combination of Dewey and Bentley in Chapters II through VII. Chapters I, VIII, and IX are the work of Bentley, and it may be well to leave them to the last. In Chapter X Dewey deals with the topic, "Common Sense and Science," and here the Master Philosopher has a message that no one should miss.

By this time a reader is well aware that he is confronting a new orientation in regard to knowings and the known (knowledge), and if I am any judge he will need to be comfortable, but not too comfortable, with a "do not disturb" sign hung outside his door. For the next 158 pages a reader will be exposed to, and by careful reading will comprehend, the essential methodology that the authors believe is "needed as a guide to inquiry into behaviors as natural events in the world." The authors state that "the basic postulate of our procedure is that knowings are observable facts in exactly the same sense as are the subject-matters that are known." They also state that "the procedure we adopt reports and describes observation on the same basis the worker in knowledge—astronomer, physicist, psychologist, etc.—employs . . . (p. 53) remembering always that the problem that concerns us is one of precision of terminology and of hoped-for accuracy of statement." (P. 245.)

If a reader follows my suggestion he winds up with Bentley's three chapters: "Vagueness in Logic" (Ch. I); "Logic in an Age of Science" (Ch. VIII); "A Confused 'Semiotic'," (Ch. IX). He will then realize fully, I believe, why a book of this character is called for today and why everyone should learn to scrutinize his verbal behavior with a new degree of insight and understanding. "Our understanding," says Dr. Bentley, speaking for the authors, "thus far has been gained by refusing to accept the words man utters as independent beings—logicians' playthings akin to magicians' vipers or children's fairies—and by insisting that language is veritably man himself in action, and thus observable." In his analysis of the language of several logicians he finds "enough evidence of linguistic chaos . . . to justify an overhauling of the entire background of recent logical construction." Of one contemporary logician, Bertrand Russell, he remarks: "A cold eye, close dissection, and often much hard work is necessary to find out what kind of a skeleton is beneath the outer clothing." There is no skeleton in Bentley's paragraphs, but nevertheless a cold eye, close dissection, and some hard work is necessary, in several spots; together with attention to footnotes (at the end of each chapter): twenty-four pages in fine print for Bentley's three chapters, and twenty-six pages for the six chapters with dual authorship.

In the Introduction we are told that "the discussions in the first chapter, as well as those that follow, are not designed primarily for criticizing individual logicians." It would seem, however, that Bentley had his finger on the trigger of both barrels when he let this sentence loose: "The procedures of Russell and Moore seem so simple-minded it is remarkable they have survived at all in the modern world." It is very evident that language is something that must be taken seriously, especially by logicians; and by all the rest of us. "Words spoken may be trifles; words written are things."

EVANS A. WORTHLEY.

Criticism of Toynbee

THE PATTERN OF THE PAST: CAN WE DETERMINE IT? *By Pieter Geyl, Arnold J. Toynbee, Pitirim Sorokin. Boston: The Beacon Press. 126 pp. $2.00.*

In most quarters, Arnold Toynbee has received extraordinary commendation, and at times adulation, for his as yet incomplete, but still monumental, *Study of History*. In this slender volume he is "taken on" and vigorously criticized by a ranking fellow historian from the University of Utrecht, and by a distinguished sociologist at Harvard. The result is interesting reading, a help in understanding Toynbee, and some of the major issues of the time.

Pieter Geyl is the first critic. His essay is followed by a series of short exchanges between him and Toynbee. Sorokin's essay concludes and has no Toynbee rejoinder.

Geyl pays tribute to Toynbee's vast erudition and his "controlled" imagination, and intellect. This tribute does not inhibit vigorous attack. The sum of the criticism is this: Toynbee claims to be empirical in method but is not, imposing more system upon history than he draws from it. The system, even when arrived at is of limited validity and gives almost no clue to a genuine interpretation of the present. Toynbee is too simplistic and too pessimistic. If Toynbee will not say it in so many words, the logic of his system says that our present civilization began its decline around the 16th century and nothing can stop it. He talks too much like a prophet, for a good empiricist, and has developed an excessively spiritualistic viewpoint, inade-

quately considering material factors. Geyl is forceful and clear in saying this.

In the following exchanges with Toynbee, both men are spirited and full of wit. It is good reading. Toynbee insists here that he is no historical determinist, and that whatever spirit of gloom accrues from his warnings of danger is not to be construed to mean that the future has no hope.

Sorokin makes some of the same points as Geyl, e.g., the formula is too rigid, is more imposed than derived, and is similar to Spengler. This reviewer did not think as much of Sorokin's criticism on the whole, however. Some of his points are peccadilloes. His main one, a criticism of Toynbee's view of a civilization as a system and as the basic unit of study, we thought "missed the boat." Sorokin uses the word "system" in a narrow philosophical sense. Toynbee does not and we do not think his purpose is necessarily committed to so use it. Sorokin is ponderous in comparison to both Geyl and Toynbee, and a little pompous. He does, however, pay tribute also to Toynbee's work as being of great and enduring value.

Not the least of the values of this book is the excellently clear statement in a few words of the main theses of Toynbee. Both critics do this before beginning their criticism. Both do it well. We agree with the publisher that this book deserves a place on the shelf beside Toynbee.

CHARLES W. PHILLIPS.

Wit and Wisdom

THE WIT AND WISDOM OF JOHN DEWEY. Edited by *A. H. Johnson. Boston: Beacon Press. 111 pp. $2.00.*

THE WIT AND WISDOM OF ALBERT SCHWEITZER. *Edited by Charles R. Joy. Boston: Beacon Press. 104 pp. $2.00.*

These two volumes are the second and third in the "Wit and Wisdom" series being published by the Beacon Press. The first volume was *The Wit and Wisdom of Whitehead.* I commented on the Whitehead edition in a previous issue of UNITY.

Prof. A. H. Johnson, who edited *The Wit and Wisdom of Whitehead,* also edited the John Dewey volume. Professor Johnson has struggled valiantly to glean some of the more cryptic and terse statements from Dewey's voluminous and weighty writings in widely varied fields. At best they give only a whisper from the clear tones of John Dewey's voice which has challenged our times in philosophy, religion, education, and ethics. However, many of these quotations if used as a starting point may provide a full evening of stimulating and challenging thought. The Introduction gives a brief portrait of the life of John Dewey and a resumé of his philosophy which is particularly valuable to one not familiar with them. For the inquiring mind this book should stimulate further excursions into Dewey's writings. For the complacent mind it could be a soporific of satisfying superficiality.

In *The Wit and Wisdom of Schweitzer,* Charles R. Joy demonstrates a deep and thorough understanding of both the man Schweitzer and his philosophy. The brief factual biography in the Introduction discloses the many facets of Albert Schweitzer's life and the several professions in which he is proficient. The quotations selected by Dr. Joy are thought provoking. At times they seem a bit didactic and thus guide one's thinking along a single channel. It would be a very rewarding journey, it should be said, particularly for those whose mystical identification with the universe is vital.

In a very real sense these are companion volumes. It is interesting and intriguing to compare and contrast these selected random thoughts of Dewey and Schweitzer on such subjects as art, religion, ethics, philosophy, civilization, etc. A naturalistic mysticism is common to both. Yet in Dewey the rational predominates while in Schweitzer the emotional provides the strongest overtones. The similarities and contrasts, the samenesses and differences, as detected from these tasty bits from two of the world's leading citizens, are delectable. One gains both in one's respect for humanity and one's reverence for life.

RANDALL S. HILTON.

The Patience of the Rocks

The high winds of the last few days seem more typical of March than January. As I walked abroad this morning, scarcely a breeze was stirring. The patient pines stood motionless against the sky. Shrub oaks and cottonwoods lifted their bare arms heavenward. The distant hills gave an impression of passive stolidity and endurance, as if they were waiting for something. All seemed to be saying, "Why hurry? There is time." Patience is not always a virtue but sometimes it is the part of wisdom and that seems to be the spirit of January. All Nature seems to be saying—there is time for all things—a time for going forward and a time for marking step—there is a time for great decisions and a time when we must live for one day at a time . . . All life will not be forced or hurried. Time and patience are required for all good things to grow. You remember that of one of the greatest Americans it was said, "The patience of the rocks was in him."

—Hurley Begun.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 102)

Missouri, he is forty-six years old, married, and has three sons. He and his wife have been active members of the Civil Liberties Union for many years.

Professor Malin is a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, class of 1924. He did graduate study at the Union Theological Seminary and Teachers College and Columbia University in New York City.

Mr. Baldwin will continue to handle the international work of the Union through three Committees, the International Civil Liberties Committee, the Committee on Occupied Countries, and the Committee on American Colonies. He will also act for the International League for the Rights of Man, of which he is Board Chairman, a UN consultative agency with which the ACLU is affiliated.

—American Civil Liberties Union Bulletin

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

APPEAL PROGRESS

Out of the fifty-five churches in the Western Conference all but six have selected their goals for the United Unitarian Appeal. In some cases this goal was higher than the suggested share. Several churches set the goal at a lower figure. To prevent further curtailment in the programs of the Unitarian agencies which have joined together to raise their funds it will be necessary for all our churches to make or exceed the selected goals. Below is a listing of the cash received from churches in the Conference as of January 15, 1950. Many of them have not yet put on their drives. It is hoped that by April 30 all will have far exceeded these amounts.

Colorado Springs	$ 25.00
Denver	25.00
Fort Collins	33.00
Alton	58.00
Chicago, First	7.00
Geneseo	225.00
Hinsdale	100.00
Moline	10.00
Quincy	64.00
Shelbyville	45.00
Urbana	5.00
Indianapolis	500.00
Louisville, First	10.00
Louisville, Clifton	175.00
Ann Arbor	200.00
Kalamazoo	350.00
Angora	65.00
Minneapolis	422.00
St. Paul	890.00
Underwood	15.00
St. Louis	1,871.00
Lincoln	172.00
Cincinnati, St. John's	220.00
Milwaukee	150.00
Boulder Fellowship	25.00
Bloomington, Ind. Fellowship	28.00
Birmingham, Mich. Fellowship	15.00
East Lansing, Mich. Fellowship	15.00
Individuals	2.00
Special Gifts	1,200.00

UNITARIAN SERVICE COMMITTEE

The Unitarian Service Committee has announced that its 1950 campaign will be in two major parts:

1. The securing of individual memberships through the churches. Each church is asked to put on a membership drive. Minimum membership is $5.00. The committee has set a goal of 25,000 memberships for 1950.

2. The local members of the Service Committee are to form the local chapter and put on a financial drive among Unitarians and non-Unitarians to raise funds for the Service Committee. This drive is to be coordinated with the financial program of the church. The local chapter is requested to notify the Service Committee of the method and time of the local campaign. It is desired that this effort not compete with the local budget or the United Appeal campaigns.

HELEN FOGG

Miss Helen Fogg, Director of Child Welfare in Europe for the Unitarian Service Committee, spent a large portion of the month of January in the Western Conference. She visited Minneapolis, St. Paul, Chicago, Evanston, St. Louis, and Cincinnati. On Sunday, January 15, she addressed over one thousand people at the evening service of the People's Church. Dr. Preston Bradley gave up his sermon that evening so that Miss Fogg could present the work of the Unitarian Service Committee.

THE ROOSEVELT COLUMN

In her column which appeared in the *Chicago Sun-Times* on January 15, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt devoted her final paragraph to praising the Child Welfare Institute conducted in Germany last summer by the Unitarian Service Committee. This was another one of the teaching missions which has brought wide acclaim to the Service Committee.

JEFFERSON MEMORIAL

The Jefferson Memorial Unitarian Church of Charlottesville, Virginia, is a fitting tribute to the religious contribution of Thomas Jefferson to the life of America. For several years this church has had plans and blueprints for an outstanding structure that would do justice to this cause. The actual construction of this building will begin this spring. This was made possible by a substantial contribution from the American Unitarian Association, voted at the meeting of the Board of Directors on January 9, 1950. The church membership, organization, and program have been steadily growing under the leadership of Rev. Malcolm Sutherland. Mr. Sutherland is a graduate of Meadville Theological School.

MINISTERS' SALARIES

Following on the heels of the work done by the Western Conference Committee on Minimum Salaries for Ministers, the American Unitarian Association has appointed a committee for raising the level of these salaries. This committee is not concerning itself with minimums but with the immediate increase of all salaries of ministers. When one considers what is required of Unitarian ministers and the significance of Unitarian churches in their communities there are exceptionally few Unitarian ministers who are not underpaid. You will be hearing more about, and from, this committee. The members of the committee are Mr. Leonard Hunting, Portland, Oregon, chairman; Mr. Roman Hruska, Omaha, Nebraska; and Dr. Wallace W. Robbins, Chicago, Illinois.

REGIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A written recommendation, looking toward the establishment of regional advisory committees, to the Unitarian Fellowship Committee was presented in October. The Fellowship Committee of the American Unitarian Association held a hearing on this at its January 8 meeting. Dr. Robbins, President of the Meadville Theological School, and Mr. Hilton, Secretary of the Western Conference and the recommendor, attended the

hearing. The Fellowship Committee voted to establish such committees. The Board of the Western Unitarian Conference, at its meeting on February 13, 1950, will consider the qualifications and personnel of such advisory committee. The advisory committee will be appointed by the Fellowship Committee on nomination by the Conference.

UNI-UNI UNION

As of January 15 all Unitarian Churches that have voted on the proposed program to prepare a plan of Union between the Unitarian and Universalist organizations have approved it. Fifty-one per cent of all Unitarian churches must express approval of the plan for it to be put in operation. The same is true of the Universalist churches. Thus the effect of a church not taking action on this question is the same as voting "no." It would appear from the latest reports that the Unitarians will support the experiment overwhelmingly. There are indications that the Universalists will have greater difficulty in achieving the required vote. There is strong opposition within the Universalist fellowship, particularly in New York state and parts of New England.

A.U.A. BY-LAWS

The May Meetings of the American Unitarian Association will vote on amendments to the By-laws proposed by Mr. Hilton at the request of the Board of the Western Conference. These amendments provide for the abolition of the office of Regional Vice-President and the nomination to the Board of the Association of a representative from the region by the region itself. This will reduce the size of the Board from thirty-seven to twenty-eight. Further, it will provide a more democratic way of achieving regional representation. (The amendments can be found on pages 176-177 in the current Unitarian Year Book.) A Grass Roots Committee for Democratic Representation on the A.U.A. Board has been formed to support these amendments. Among the signers and members of this committee are:

Randall S. Hilton, Chicago, Illinois
Wallace W. Robbins, Chicago, Illinois
E. Burdette Backus, Indianapolis, Indiana
Aron S. Gilmartin, Fort Wayne, Indiana
Philip Schug, Lincoln, Nebraska
H. I. S. Borgford, Chicago, Illinois
Ralph N. Helverson, Ithaca, New York
Curtis W. Reese, Chicago, Illinois
William D. Hammond, Chicago, Illinois
Max D. Gaebler, Davenport, Iowa
Thaddeus B. Clark, St. Louis, Missouri
Philip Petursson, Winnipeg, Canada
Frank Ricker, Berkeley, California
Leonard M. Hunting, Portland, Oregon
Margot I. Piekson, St. Louis, Missouri

The advantage of each of the organized regional areas in nominating their own representative on the A.U.A. Board should be clear to all. The value of cutting down the size of the Board is two-fold: (1), it would greatly reduce the expense of Board meetings at a time when it is sorely needed; and, (2), a smaller Board can operate far more efficiently, particularly when it is truly a representative Board.

While these amendments are to be voted on only by the delegates in attendance at the May meetings churches interested in them can instruct their delegates. Also, churches can communicate their wishes to the Annual Meeting of the Association, asking that their desires be made a matter of record.

The number of amendments that were presented last May for action this coming May makes it imperative that the wishes of the grass roots be made known. Little time is being provided for their consideration and it is not inconceivable that this amendment, along with others, might be tabled without considering its merits.

Persons desiring to have their names added to the Grass Roots Committee may do so by writing the Conference Office.

GENEVA 1950

The Lake Geneva Summer Conference will be held August 20-27, 1950, at College Camp, Wisconsin. Among those who have already accepted positions on the faculty are Dr. Jacob Trapp, Mr. Malcolm Knowles, and Rev. Ernest Kuebler. They will be on both the A.U.Y. and Adult programs.

BLANSHARD BOOK

American Freedom and Catholic Power, by Paul Blanshard, is still hitting the best-seller lists. All previous Beacon Press records have been broken. Over 100,000 copies have been printed within less than a year of publication date.

Mr. Blanshard is covering the Holy Year activities in Rome for the *Nation* magazine. He is also working on a new book in the American Freedom Series which will deal with the methods and policies of both the Kremlin and the Vatican.

American Freedom and Catholic Power can be ordered through the Conference Office.

A UNIVERSALIST BOOK

Religion Can Make Sense, by Dr. Clinton Lee Scott, has been released by the Universalist Publishing House. This is a witty, pithy, and down-to-earth presentation of liberal religion. Dr. Scott, formerly minister of the Universalist church in Peoria, Illinois, and of the Unitarian church in Dayton, Ohio, is now State Superintendent of the Massachusetts Universalist Convention. Copies of this book can be ordered through the Conference Office.

THOSE APOSTATE COMMUNISTS

"As long as a man is a Communist he is a stupid and odoriferous nincompoop, it seems. But let him be converted, and that minute he qualifies as a university professor, as the darling of investigation committees and magazine editors, and as the prophet of the hour! To the Editor of the *Unitarian* he's still the same man turned inside out—but with this one difference: If he's the convert, we get his aroma continuously from the housetops rather than as mere occasional seepage from the underground. Certainly for the mediocre man who adores publicity, cherishes his hatreds, and longs for a measure of opulence, conversion is infinitely more immediate and remunerative than revolution."

—*R. Lester Mondale.*

WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE ANNUAL MEETINGS
LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, APRIL 28, 29, 30, 1950